

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Final Office Action dated September 2, 2004, claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejections.

Claim 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failure to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to remove the word "interconnected" and replace it with the words "wirelessly communicating." Claim 1 has also been amended to remove the ambiguity of which vehicle network the transmitter is communicating with.

Claim 8 was amended in the last Office Action to remove the word "in" in line 7. Applicants believe that this amendment overcomes this rejection. The Examiner further states that it is not clear how an abstract object such as the location-specific information could be coupled to a physical object (the network). It is clear from the specification that the location-specific information is communicated in a type of communication signal and thus is "coupled" to the network. That is, the information is wirelessly coupled to a network such as through a transmitter/receiver.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Taylor* (2003/1069181) in view of *Benjamin* (2003/0073406).

Claim 1 is directed to a vehicle within a network. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the vehicles within a network are interconnected vehicles. The vehicle includes a positioning system that generates a vehicle position signal, a transmitter communicating the vehicle position signal to the plurality of vehicles within the vehicle network. A receiver within the vehicle network receives location-specific information from a communications network outside the vehicle network and the transmitter couples the location-specific information to the vehicle network. A network controller maintains a vehicle network connection with each of the

plurality of vehicles in the vehicle network in response to the vehicle position signal. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 as amended is not taught or suggested in the *Taylor* reference. The *Taylor* reference illustrates a communications system that has an emergency vehicle 10 as is illustrated in Fig. 1. The emergency vehicle 10 broadcasts various information to the receiving units (RU) in response to the location from the transmitting unit or EV. In other embodiments the EV has been replaced by a stationary transmitting device that also communicates with receiving units. However, the stationary device communicates with the receiving units within a certain distance. One significant difference between the claims of the present invention and the *Taylor* reference is that the transmitting unit communicates directly with the receiving units. The receiving units do not communicate with each other in a network. As is recited in paragraph 6 of the present application, "One advantage of the invention is that location-specific information is more quickly provided to the vehicles within the vehicle network. That is, less repetition is required by the telematics provider and the cost of providing such information is reduced." The transmitting unit does not have to transmit to each of the other vehicles as is done in the *Taylor* reference. In the present application, only one of the vehicles in the communication network needs to be coupled to the communication system. Thereafter, the information is provided within the network for each of the vehicles. In a large system it is contemplated that several vehicle networks may be present. The communication logistics of providing various types of information from a single transmitting unit illustrate that the present application is advantageous. Applicants respectfully submit that the *Taylor* reference does not teach a vehicle network having a plurality of interconnected vehicles. *Taylor* does not teach or suggest that any of the receiving units communicates with anything other than the transmitting unit or EV 10. That is, no information is provided regarding receiving unit 14A to any other of the receiving units through the transmitting unit. Therefore, no vehicle network is provided. The receiving units appear to communicate directly with the transmitting unit. A receiver within the vehicle receives specific vehicle information from a communication network outside of the

vehicle network and the transmitter couples the location-specific information to the network. This is not taught or suggested in the *Taylor* reference.

The Examiner agrees that the *Taylor* reference does not explicitly supply location specific information from a communication network outside the vehicle network. The Examiner supplies the *Benjamin* reference for this teaching. The *Benjamin* reference is a system by which vehicles are associated in a network. The vehicles may communicate through other vehicles to the internet or a cellular telephone network. The Examiner points to paragraphs 62 and 66 of the *Benjamin* reference for the teaching of location-specific information from a network. Applicants respectfully submit that paragraph 62 teaches communication out of the network. Paragraph 66 mentions that the mobile units may send e-mail, access websites on the internet, receive streaming audio and video, and indeed perform any other functions that can be performed using the internet such as paying bills, reviewing stocks, etc. Applicants respectfully submit that no location-specific information is taught or suggested in the *Benjamin* reference. Paragraph 21 of the present application mentions, for example, incident reporting, road hazards, accident, construction, road conditions (black ice), may be communicated. These are examples of location-specific information. No such location-specific information is therefore taught in the *Benjamin* reference. Furthermore, it would not be obvious to modify the teachings of the *Benjamin* reference for supplying the vehicles with location information since general use of the internet and a cellular system only are mentioned. Therefore, applicants respectfully request the Examiner for a reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1. Likewise, claims 2-7 are also believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

Claims 8-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Taylor*.

Claim 8 is directed to a communication system having a plurality of vehicles in communication forming a wireless network therebetween in the *Taylor* reference. Also, the telematics system is coupled to the vehicle network through the communications network. The

telematics system generates location-specific information and couples the location-specific information to the wireless vehicle network through the communication network so the vehicle information is provided to each of the plurality of vehicles in the vehicle network. Applicants respectfully submit that this clause is also not taught or suggested in the *Taylor* reference. Location-specific information is provided to the transmitting unit. However, the information is not coupled to a network to advantageously reduce the amount of communications provided through the transmitting unit as described above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider claim 8.

Claim 17 is directed to a method of operating a communication network. The first claim is "generating communication signals among a plurality of vehicles to form a wireless network therebetween." As mentioned above, applicants respectfully submit that the *Taylor* reference does not form a wireless network between a plurality of vehicles. The transmitting unit merely provides a way of communicating to each of the receiving units and does not communicate or allow communication between various receiving units. Claim 17 further recites, "transmitting location-specific information from the telematics provider to the wireless network and distributing the location-specific information among the plurality of vehicles within the wireless network." As mentioned above, applicants respectfully believe that this is not taught or suggested in the *Taylor* reference. Therefore, applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration of claim 17.

Claims 2-7, 9-16, and 18-20 are dependent upon claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicants submit that all rejections are now overcome. The applicants have added no new material to the application by these amendments. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to Deposit Account 06-

1510.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin G. Mierzwa
Reg. No. 38,049
28333 Telegraph Road
Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Date: _____

10/21/04